



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

passant, Garnett, Anatole France, Gorky and Masefield. The translations are, in general, adequate, and the editorial introduction and notes balance the felicity of the selection. Mr. Rudwin, a Polish-American, is a specialist in the literature of the subject, having written several works dealing with the Devil in the German religious plays of the Middle Ages and the Reformation, and with the Devil in modern French literature. He is also editing other anthologies of like character to include Devil Plays, Devil Essays, Devil Legends, the story of Lilith, Satanic verse and *Bibliographia Diabolica*. The intention is to provide "a sort of portrait-gallery of the literary delineations of Satan" in many times and countries.

That Mr. Lyons, himself a first-rate humorist, should find so much to praise in Leonard Merrick's *A Chair on the Boulevard* is significant of its value, despite the too great generosity of the former's words. There is not a dull story in this book. Each is roguishly absurd or winsomely human, or both, and Mr. Merrick is wise enough, after winning for the poet, Gustave Tricotrin, and his friend the composer, Nicolas Pitou (of *While Paris Laughed*), the regard of those who have not previously met them, to tie together these twenty stories—filled with the provisional exultations and despairs of irresponsible youth—as loosely connected episodes in the careers of the lovable poet and his comrade. Behind and about all, are Paris and Montmartre and the spirit of adventure, with its devastating emotions and its romantic resilience.

G. H. C.

THE STYLE AND LITERARY METHOD OF LUKE. By Henry J. Cadbury, Lecturer in the New Testament, Andover Theological Seminary. Harvard Theological Studies, Number VI. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1920. Pp. vii, 205.

This is an exceedingly valuable and interesting section of the large subject of the Lukan authorship of the third Gospel and of the Acts, and of the general considerations which are connected with that subject. It gives evidence on every page of a minutely critical scholarship, limited, however, to, and based upon, a keen, thorough and comprehensive verbal analysis.

Few conclusions are offered, as is fitting, and there is, naturally, little that appeals to the general reader, although it contains a

great deal of valuable information and suggestion for the critical student.

The book is in two parts, at first published separately, but now issued in one volume. The first part deals with the diction of the third Gospel and Acts, and includes a lengthy scholarly treatment of "The Alleged Medical Language of Luke" with a criticism of Hobart, Harnack and Zahn, and including a Note on the History of the Discussion by Dr. G. F. Moore.

Special attention is due to the writer's criticism of the theory that Luke was a physician, so far as that theory rests upon the medical language used by Luke. This criticism is based upon a critical analysis of the so-called medical terms, and is made more significant by an exhaustive comparison of Luke's language with Lucian, in criticism of Hobart's comparison. The author concludes:—

"In comparing the language of Luke with the corresponding expressions in Mark or Matthew, the fact that the term in Luke is found in the medical writers does not prove that he is a physician, for a well educated person such as Luke evidently was, even without special medical training would use more technical terms than a less educated person. The general difference between Luke and the other synoptists is shown elsewhere to be a marked difference in culture."

Dr. Cadbury's section on Luke's treatment of his sources is an interesting and valuable part of his work.

"The general accuracy", he concludes, "that we may presume of all the New Testament text is an additional advantage possessed by the comparison of Mark and Luke over the comparison of any other two ancient books outside the New Testament, either or both of which rest on less trustworthy textual tradition."

This treatise is a good piece of work. It is intended, of course, to be only philological. Yet some interesting questions are omitted. In criticising Luke's use of Mark the author might have compared Matthew's use of Mark. Did Luke have an Aramaic source, either in Mark or in other sources? Where did Luke get his Herodian material? Are not the changes in Luke due to the difference of his object? He was writing to

Theophilus, a Greek, or one representing the Greek; his Gospel was not for the Jews: *e. g.*, he does not use 'Rabbi' but 'Epistates' or 'Didaskolos'.

The brief preface contains some statements worthy of note. After calling attention to the new light thrown on the New Testament Greek by the recent discovery of an immense number of papyri, showing that the Greek of the New Testament was the common Greek vernacular of the period and in general use throughout the Roman Empire, the writer states two assumptions, which he adopts, and which are all but universally accepted by scholars: First, that the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles were the work of the same author, approximately in their present form; second, that the Gospel of Luke is based upon a Greek source, substantially identical with our Mark, and also upon further Greek memorabilia (commonly called Q) both of which were also used by Matthew. These two assumptions are very significant as the final conclusion of the most searching analytical criticism extending over a century and a half.

The name of the author of the Gospel and Acts has been left an open question, although the Lukan authorship is now generally accepted; at any rate, there are no very strong arguments against it.

CHARLES L. WELLS.

FROM A FLAT HOUSOTOP. By Charlotte Hardin. Boston: The Four Seas Company. 1920. Pp. 67.

THE WIND OVER THE WATER. By Philip Merivale. Boston: The Four Seas Company. 1920. Pp. 50.

MOODS OF MANHATTAN. By Louise Mallinckrodt Kueffner. New York: The Modernist Press. 1920. Pp. 61.

None of these three slight volumes constitutes or even contains a contribution to poetry. The first, although it seems conditioned by not inadequate emotional moods, lacks the adequate voice: its reed is thin, uncertain. The second is a one-act play written in blank verse, and laid in the Iceland of the twelfth century. It has a smooth grace and a symbolic suggestiveness touching the mysteries of change; but stylistic propriety is not a synonym for authentic power. The third is a grotesquely unsuccessful effort to uphold the banner of the Imagists.